

**BIBIYAN LAW GROUP, P.C.**

David D. Bibiyan (Cal. Bar No. 287811)

*david@tomorrowlaw.com*

Jeffrey D. Klein (Cal. Bar. No. 297296)

*jeff@tomorrowlaw.com*

Henry G. Glitz (Cal. Bar. No. 349815)

*henry@tomorrowlaw.com*

1460 Westwood Boulevard

Los Angeles, California 90024

Tel: (310) 438-5555; Fax: (310) 300-1705

Attorneys for Plaintiff, CHRISTIAN DARRELL EGAN,

as an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other

aggrieved employees

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

CHRISTIAN DARRELL EGAN, as an  
aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other  
aggrieved employees under the Labor Code  
Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004,

Plaintiff,

v.

LEUCADIA PIZZA POINT LOMA, INC., a  
California corporation; LEUCADIA PIZZA  
ENC, INC., a California corporation;  
LEUCADIA PIZZA SCRIPPS RANCH, INC.,  
a California corporation; LEUCADIA PIZZA  
TAMARACK, INC., a California corporation;  
LEUCADIA PIZZA UTC, INC., a California  
corporation; and DOES 1 through 100,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

**ELECTRONICALLY FILED**

Superior Court of California,  
County of San Diego

**05/14/2024** at 02:43:55 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Shiela Retez, Deputy Clerk

CASE NO.: 37-2024-00022194-CU-OE-CTL

**REPRESENTATIVE ACTION**

**COMPLAINT UNDER THE LABOR  
CODE PRIVATE ATTORNEYS'  
GENERAL ACT OF 2004 FOR CIVIL  
PENALTIES UNDER LABOR CODE  
SECTIONS 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1  
and 2699**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

[Amount in Controversy Greater Than  
\$25,000.00]

1 Plaintiff Christian Darrell Egan, as an aggrieved employee, and on behalf of all other  
2 aggrieved employees under the Labor Code Private Attorneys' General Act of 2004, alleges as  
3 follows:

#### 4 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

5 1. This is a representative action, pursuant to the Labor Code Private Attorneys General  
6 Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* ("PAGA"), against Leucadia Pizza Point  
7 Loma, Inc., a California corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies  
8 within the State of California ("LP Point Loma"); Leucadia Pizza ENC, Inc., a California  
9 corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of  
10 California ("LP ENC"); Leucadia Pizza Scripps Ranch, Inc., a California corporation, and any of its  
11 respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State of California ("LP Scripps Ranch");  
12 Leucadia Pizza Tamarack, Inc., a California corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or  
13 affiliated companies within the State of California ("LP Tamarack"); Leucadia Pizza UTC, Inc., a  
14 California corporation, and any of its respective subsidiaries or affiliated companies within the State  
15 of California ("LP UTC") (collectively, and with DOES 1 through 100, as further defined below,  
16 "Defendants"), as a proxy of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency of the State of  
17 California ("LWDA"), on behalf of Plaintiff and all other current and former non-exempt employees  
18 of Defendants working within the Civil Penalty Period, as further defined herein, and, as it pertains  
19 to the alleged claims for failure to comply with Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 202, 203,  
20 204, 210, 226, 226.3, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7, 432.8, 1102.5, 1197.5,  
21 1198.5, 1527, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, on behalf of all employees of Defendants working within the  
22 Civil Penalty Period (collectively, "Aggrieved Employees").

23 2. Jurisdiction exists in the Superior Court of the State of California pursuant to Code  
24 of Civil Procedure section 410.10.

25 3. Venue is proper in San Diego County, California pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure  
26 sections 392, *et seq.* because, among other things, San Diego County is where the causes of action  
27 complained of herein arose; the county in which the employment relationship began; the county in  
28 which performance of the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff and Defendants was

1 due to be performed; the county in which the employment contract, or part of it, between Plaintiff  
2 and Defendants was actually performed; and the county in which Defendants, or some of them,  
3 reside. Moreover, the unlawful acts alleged herein have a direct effect on Plaintiff and Aggrieved  
4 Employees in San Diego County, and because Defendants employ numerous Aggrieved Employees  
5 in San Diego County.

6 4. Plaintiff is an “aggrieved employee” under PAGA, as Plaintiff was employed by  
7 Defendants during the applicable statutory period and suffered one or more of the Labor Code  
8 violations set forth herein. Accordingly, Plaintiff seeks to recover civil penalties, as the term “civil  
9 penalty” is defined under *ZB N.A. v. Superior Court* (2019) 8 Cal.5th 175, under the Labor Code  
10 Private Attorneys General Act of 2004, codified at Labor Code section 2698, *et seq.* (“PAGA”) plus  
11 reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs, for Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former  
12 employees of Defendants during the Civil Penalty Period.

13 5. Specifically, Plaintiff seeks to recover PAGA civil penalties through a representative  
14 action permitted by PAGA and the California Supreme Court in, among other authorities, *Arias v.*  
15 *Superior Court* (2009) 46 Cal.4th 969. According to the same authorities, class certification of the  
16 PAGA allegations described herein is not required.

17 6. During the period beginning one (1) year preceding the provision of notice to the  
18 LWDA regarding the herein-described Labor Code violations (the “Civil Penalty Period”),  
19 Defendants violated, *inter alia*, Labor Code sections 96, 98.6, 200, 201, 201.3, 202, 203, 204, 210,  
20 212, 213, 221, 223, 226, 226.3, 226.7, 227.3, 232, 232.5, 245, 246, 404, 432, 432.3, 432.5, 432.7,  
21 432.8, 510, 512, 558, 1102.5, 1174, 1174.5, 11821.12, 1194, 1197, 1197.1, 1197.5, 1198.5, 1527,  
22 2699, 2802, 2810.5, 3366, 3457, and 8397.4, among others, California Code of Regulations, Title  
23 8, Section 3395, Business and Professions Code sections 16600, 16700, and 17200, Government  
24 Code section 12952, as well as applicable Wage Orders.

25 7. Labor Code section 2699, subdivisions (a) and (g), authorizes aggrieved employees  
26 such as Plaintiff, on behalf of Plaintiff and all other aggrieved current and former employees within  
27 the statutory period, to bring a civil action to recover civil penalties pursuant to the procedures  
28 specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

8. On or around February 26, 2024, Plaintiff provided written notice pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3 online and by certified mail, with return receipt requested, of Defendants' violation of various, including the herein-described, provisions of the Labor Code, to the LWDA, as well as by certified mail, with return receipt requested to Defendants, and each of them.

9. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699.3, subdivision (a)(2)(A), the LWDA did not provide notice of its intention to investigate Defendants' alleged violations within sixty-five (65) calendar days of the February 26, 2024 postmarked date of the herein-described notice sent by Plaintiff to the LWDA and Defendants.

## **PAGA REPRESENTATIVE ALLEGATIONS**

10. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing to pay overtime wages to Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees in the State of California in violation of California state wage and hour laws as a result of, without limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees working over eight (8) hours per day, forty (40) hours per week, and/or seven (7) straight workdays in a workweek without paying them proper overtime wages, as a result of, without limitation, failing to accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock, including, without limitation, by requiring employees: to remain on-call, to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to don and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock, to make phone calls or drive off the clock; failing to include all forms of remuneration, including non-discretionary bonuses, incentive pay, meal allowances, and other forms of remuneration into the regular rate of pay for the pay periods where overtime was worked and the additional compensation was earned for the purpose of calculating the overtime rate of pay; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked, for paying straight pay instead of overtime pay, and by attempting but failing to properly implement an alternative workweek schedule ("AWS") (including, without limitation, by failing to implement a written agreement designating the regularly scheduled alternative workweek in which the specified number of work days and work

1 hours are regularly recurring; failing to adopt the AWS in a secret ballot election, before the  
2 performance of work, by at least a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the affected employees in the work unit;  
3 failing to follow the notice/disclosures procedures prior to any AWS election; and/or failing to  
4 register an AWS election with the State of California, as required by Labor Code section 511 and  
5 applicable Wage Orders), to the detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

6 11. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a practice or policy  
7 of failing to compensate Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with minimum wages for all hours  
8 worked or otherwise under Defendants' control as a result of, without limitation, failing to  
9 accurately track and/or pay for all minutes actually worked; by requiring Aggrieved Employees: to  
10 remain on-call; to suffer under Defendants' control to complete pre-shift tasks before clocking in  
11 and post-shift tasks after clocking out, to clock out for meal periods and continue working, to don  
12 and doff uniforms and/or safety equipment off the clock, to attend company meetings off the clock,  
13 to make phone calls or drive off the clock; detrimental rounding of employee time entries, editing  
14 and/or manipulation of time entries to show less hours than actually worked; failing to pay reporting  
15 time pay; paid time off and vacation time owed; and failing to pay split shift premiums, to the  
16 detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees.

17 12. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
18 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees a thirty (30) minute uninterrupted,  
19 timely, and complete meal period for days on which the employee worked in excess of five (5) and  
20 ten (10) hours per day without being afforded uninterrupted, timely, and complete 30-minute meal  
21 periods or compensation in lieu thereof including, without limitation, by interrupting meal periods;  
22 not providing timely meal periods; failing to provide first and second meal periods; providing short  
23 meal periods; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during meal  
24 periods; not permitting employees to leave the premises; otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call meal  
25 periods; and/or auto-deducting meal periods that could not be auto-deducted by law or during which  
26 employees worked, as required by California wage and hour laws.

27 13. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
28 of failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees paid, uninterrupted, timely, and

1 complete rest periods of at least ten (10) minutes per four (4) hours worked or major fractions  
2 thereof, or compensation in lieu thereof, including, without limitation, by failing to provide rest  
3 periods all together; requiring that they be bundled together and/or with meal periods; interrupting  
4 them; requiring that employees carry cellular telephones or walkie-talkies during rest periods not  
5 providing them in a timely fashion; and not permitting employees to leave the premises; and/or  
6 otherwise requiring on-duty/on-call rest periods, as required by California wage and hour laws.

7 14. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing  
8 to permit Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees from taking cooldown rest periods as required under  
9 California Code of Regulations, Title 8, Section 3395, and have failed to pay premium pay in lieu  
10 thereof under Labor Code section 226.7.

11 15. At all times relevant hereto, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing  
12 to pay premium payments under Labor Code section 226.7 to Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees  
13 for non-compliant meal periods and rest periods, as well as the failure to provide cooldown periods,  
14 at the proper regular rate of pay in violation of Labor Code sections 512, 226.7, and applicable wage  
15 orders.

16 16. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of  
17 unlawfully deducting wages due, or to become due, or as an advance on wages to be earned; an  
18 order, check, draft, note, memorandum, gift card, or other acknowledgment of indebtedness, (unless  
19 it was negotiable and payable in cash, on demand, without discount, at some established place of  
20 business in the state), the name and address of which must but did not appear on the instrument, and  
21 at the time of its issuance and for a reasonable time thereafter, which must be but was not at least  
22 30 days, the maker or drawer did not have sufficient funds in, or credit arrangement, or  
23 understanding with the drawee for its payment of any scrip, coupon, or other thing redeemable, in  
24 merchandise, or purporting to be payable or redeemable otherwise than in money. Plaintiff is further  
25 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that such wages were not compensated at the  
26 "regular rate" of compensation as provided under Labor Code sections 226.7 and 510, subsection  
27 (a).

28 ///

1        17.        At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
2 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish  
3 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage statements that accurately reflect gross  
4 wages earned; total hours worked by the employee; net wages earned; all deductions; all applicable  
5 hourly rates in effect during the pay period and the corresponding number of hours worked at each  
6 hourly rate by the employee; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and address of the  
7 legal entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other  
8 such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

9        18.        At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
10 of failing to comply with Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a) by intentionally failing to furnish  
11 Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with documents signed to obtain or hold employment  
12 under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records  
13 under Labor Code section 1174, making it difficult for Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to  
14 calculate their unpaid wages and/or premium payments, to the detriment of Plaintiff and other  
15 Aggrieved Employees.

16        19.        At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
17 of failing to timely pay Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, among other wages, all wages  
18 owed as a result of Defendants' practice or policy of failing to pay, among other wages, overtime  
19 wages at the regular rate of pay, minimum wages, premium wages at the regular rate of pay, paid  
20 time off, paid sick leave, and vacation time owed as required by Labor Code sections 201, 202, and  
21 203.

22        20.        At all relevant times herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice of failing  
23 to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their paid time off and vacation time owed upon  
24 separation of employment as wages at their final rate of pay in violation of Labor Code section 227.3  
25 and applicable Wage Orders.

26        21.        At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of  
27 failing and refusing, and continue to fail and refuse, to reimburse employees, including, without  
28 limitation, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees, with their costs incurred for driving personal

1 vehicles (*i.e.*, mileage and gas), purchasing uniforms, including, without limitation, for steel-toe  
2 boots, non-slip shoes, and other safety and/or personal protective equipment (“PPE”), providing  
3 uniform and other deposits, separately laundering mandatory uniforms, for the purchase of tools,  
4 and for the purchase and maintenance of cellular phones and cellular phone plans, in direct  
5 consequence of the discharge of their duties, or of their obedience to the directions of Defendants,  
6 as required by Labor Code 2802.

7 22. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of  
8 failing to comply with the notice requirements of Labor Code section 2810.5 (*i.e.*, the Wage Theft  
9 Protection Act of 2011) by, among other things, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved  
10 Employees with the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment;  
11 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage; the regular payday designated by Defendants; the  
12 name, address, and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance carrier; information  
13 regarding paid sick leave; and other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants  
14 under Labor Code section 2810.5.

15 23. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants failed to provide Plaintiff and  
16 other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick leave required to be provided pursuant to  
17 California law (including, without limitation Labor Code section 245, *et seq.*), and also did not  
18 permit its use upon request as contemplated under California laws, to the detriment of Plaintiff and  
19 all other Aggrieved Employees.

20 24. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had or have a policy or practice  
21 of failing to reimburse deposits made, including uniform deposits, together with all interest owed at  
22 the separation of employment in violation of Labor Code section 404.

23 25. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants have had a policy or practice of  
24 failing to pay Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees their wages in accordance with Labor Code  
25 Section 204, which requires that: “[l]abor performed between the 1st and 15th days, inclusive, of  
26 any calendar month shall be paid for between the 16th and 26th day of the month during which the  
27 labor was performed, and labor performed between the 16th and the last day, inclusive of any  
28 calendar month, shall be paid for between the 1st and 10th day of the following month.”

1       26.       At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy  
2 of failing to provide all working employees with suitable seats when the nature of the work  
3 reasonably permits the use of seats. Defendants have also failed to place an adequate number of  
4 seats in reasonable proximity to the work area and/or permitted employees to use such seats when  
5 it does not interfere with the performance of their duties and employees are not engaged in the active  
6 duties of their employment, and the nature of their work requires standing.

7       27.       At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy  
8 of failing to provide all temporary workers with owed wages weekly by not later than the regular  
9 payday of the following week.

10       28.       At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy  
11 of failing to provide adequate and readily accessible sanitation facilities; a regular schedule for  
12 servicing, cleaning, and supplying each facility to ensure it is maintained in a clean, sanitary and  
13 serviceable condition; an adequate supply of suitable cleansing agents, water, single-use towels or  
14 blowers; and a sufficient number of toilets to be used by each sex of employee.

15       29.       At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a policy  
16 of failing to conducting unlawful background checks on prospective and current employees prior to  
17 making a conditional offer. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that  
18 Defendants violated applicable laws by, without limitation: requiring job applicants and employees  
19 to disclose their conviction history before Defendants made a conditional offer of employment;  
20 inquiring into or considering the conviction history of applicants before Defendants made any  
21 conditional offers of employment; considering, distributing, or disseminating information about  
22 arrests not followed by conviction, referrals to or participation in a pretrial or posttrial diversion  
23 program, convictions that have been sealed, dismissed, expunged, or statutorily eradicated pursuant  
24 to law, or any conviction for which the convicted person has received a full pardon or has been  
25 issued a certificate of rehabilitation, while conducting conviction history background checks in  
26 connection with any applications for employment; intending to deny an applicant a position of  
27 employment solely or in part because of the applicant's conviction history; and asking applicants  
28 for employment to disclose, through any written form or verbally, information concerning or related

1 to an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication, or court disposition that  
2 occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of the juvenile court, to the  
3 detriment of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees

4 30. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a practice  
5 or policy of relying on the salary history information of an applicant for employment as a factor in  
6 determining whether to offer employment to an applicant or what salary to offer the applicant in  
7 violation of Labor Code section 432.3 by including, on Defendants' application for employment, an  
8 inquiry regarding current and/or former salary history information, including, without limitation,  
9 compensation and benefits of the applicant for employment.

10 31. At all times mentioned herein, Defendants have had, and continue to have, a practice  
11 or policy of requiring Aggrieved Employees to agree in writing to confidentiality policies that  
12 unlawfully restrain trade by prohibiting Employees from speaking with prospective employers about  
13 their work with Defendants, including but not limited to their wages and working conditions.  
14 Defendants also required Aggrieved Employees to inform prospective employers of Defendants'  
15 restrictions of Aggrieved Employees' freedom to work.

16 32. At all relevant times mentioned herein, Defendants had and have a policy or practice  
17 of preventing Plaintiff and/or Aggrieved Employees from using or disclosing the skills, knowledge  
18 and experience they obtained at Defendants for purposes of competing with Defendants, including,  
19 without limitation, preventing Aggrieved Employees from disclosing their wages in negotiating a  
20 new job with a prospective employer, and from disclosing who else works at Defendants and under  
21 what circumstances that they might be receptive to an offer from a rival employer. Plaintiff is  
22 informed and believes that this policy and/or practice violates Business and Professions Code  
23 sections 17200, 16600 and 16700, and, by virtue thereof, various provisions of the Labor Code,  
24 including Labor Code sections 232, 232.5, and 1197.5, subdivision (k).

25 33. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other  
26 Aggrieved Employees from disclosing violations of state and federal law, either within Defendants  
27 to their managers or outside to private attorneys or government officials, among others, in violation  
28 of Business and Professions Code section 17200, and, thus, in violation of Labor Code section

1 1102.5. In addition, Plaintiff is informed and believes that Defendants' herein-described policies  
2 and/or practices prevent Plaintiff and/or other Aggrieved Employees from disclosing information  
3 about unsafe or discriminatory working conditions, or about wage and hour violations in violation  
4 of Labor Code section 232 and 232.5.

5 34. Defendants had and have a policy or practice of preventing Plaintiff and/or other  
6 Aggrieved Employees from engaging in lawful conduct during non-work hours, thus violating state  
7 statutes entitling employees to disclose wages, working conditions, and illegal conduct, including,  
8 without limitation, Labor Code sections 96, subdivision (k), 98.6, 232, 232.5, and 1197.5,  
9 subdivision (k). Plaintiff is informed and believes that this lawful conduct includes the exercise of  
10 Plaintiff's and/or other Aggrieved Employee's constitutional rights of freedom of speech and  
11 economic liberty.

12 35. Plaintiff, in Plaintiff's representative capacity, seeks civil penalties under Labor  
13 Code sections 210, 226.3, 558, 1174.5, 1197.1, and 2699 for the herein-described acts, which violate  
14 the California Labor Code as described above, including on behalf of Plaintiff and other Aggrieved  
15 Employees pursuant to PAGA.

## 16 **PARTIES**

### 17 **A. Plaintiff**

18 36. Plaintiff is a resident of the State of California. At all relevant times herein, Plaintiff  
19 is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants employed Plaintiff as a non-  
20 exempt employee, with duties that included, but were not limited to, delivering commissary food,  
21 rolling heavy food carts, unloading food, cutting pizza, folding boxes, and delivering pizza. Plaintiff  
22 is informed and believes that Plaintiff worked for Defendants from approximately January of 2021  
23 through at least February of 2024.

### 24 **B. Defendants**

25 37. Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant LP Point  
26 Loma is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by  
27 virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of  
28 California.

1       38.       Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant LP ENC  
2 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of  
3 the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

4       39.       Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant LP  
5 Scripps Ranch is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under  
6 and by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego,  
7 State of California.

8       40.       Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant LP  
9 Tamarack is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and  
10 by virtue of the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State  
11 of California.

12       41.       Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that defendant LP UTC  
13 is, and at all times relevant hereto was, a corporation organized and existing under and by virtue of  
14 the laws of the State of California and doing business in the County of San Diego, State of California.

15       42.       The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or otherwise,  
16 of defendants sued herein as DOES 1 through 100, inclusive, are currently unknown to Plaintiff,  
17 who therefore sues defendants by such fictitious names under Code of Civil Procedure section 474.  
18 Plaintiff is informed and believes and based thereon alleges that each of the defendants designated  
19 herein as DOE is legally responsible in some manner for the unlawful acts referred to herein.  
20 Plaintiff will seek leave of court to amend this Complaint to reflect the true names and capacities of  
21 the defendants designated hereinafter as DOES when such identities become known. Plaintiff is  
22 informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that each defendant acted in all respects pertinent  
23 to this action, as the agent of the other defendant(s), carried out a joint scheme, business plan or  
24 policy in all respects pertinent hereto, and the acts of each defendant are legally attributable to the  
25 other defendants. Whenever, heretofore or hereinafter, reference is made to “Defendants,” it shall  
26 include LP Point Loma, LP ENC, LP Scripps Ranch, LP Tamarack, LP UTC, and any of their parent,  
27 subsidiary, or affiliated companies within the State of California, as well as DOES 1 through 100  
28 identified herein.

1 **JOINT LIABILITY ALLEGATIONS**

2 43. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that at all times  
3 mentioned herein, each of the defendants was the agent, principal, employee, employer,  
4 representative, joint venture or co-conspirator of each of the other defendants, either actually or  
5 ostensibly, and in doing the things alleged herein acted within the course and scope of such agency,  
6 employment, joint venture, and conspiracy.

7 44. All of the acts and conduct described herein of each and every corporate defendant  
8 was duly authorized, ordered, and directed by the respective and collective defendant corporate  
9 employers, and the officers and management-level employees of said corporate employers. In  
10 addition thereto, said corporate employers participated in the aforementioned acts and conduct of  
11 their said employees, agents, and representatives, and each of them; and upon completion of the  
12 aforesaid acts and conduct of said corporate employees, agents, and representatives, the defendant  
13 corporation respectively and collectively ratified, accepted the benefits of, condoned, lauded,  
14 acquiesced, authorized, and otherwise approved of each and all of the said acts and conduct of the  
15 aforementioned corporate employees, agents and representatives.

16 45. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that despite the  
17 formation of the purported corporate existence of LP Point Loma, LP ENC, LP Scripps Ranch, LP  
18 Tamarack, LP UTC, and DOES 1 through 50, inclusive (the "Alter Ego Defendants"), they, and  
19 each of them, are one and the same with DOES 51 through 100 ("Individual Defendants"), and each  
20 of them, due to, but not limited to, the following reasons:

21 a. The Alter Ego Defendants are completely dominated and controlled by the  
22 Individual Defendants who personally committed the wrongful and illegal acts and violated the laws  
23 as set forth in this Complaint, and who have hidden and currently hide behind the Alter Ego  
24 Defendants to perpetrate frauds, circumvent statutes, or accomplish some other wrongful or  
25 inequitable purpose;

26 b. The Individual Defendants derive actual and significant monetary benefits by  
27 and through the Alter Ego Defendants' unlawful conduct, and by using the Alter Ego Defendants as  
28 the funding source for the Individual Defendants' own personal expenditures;

1 c. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the Individual  
2 Defendants and the Alter Ego Defendants, while really one and the same, were segregated to appear  
3 as though separate and distinct for purposes of perpetrating a fraud, circumventing a statute, or  
4 accomplishing some other wrongful or inequitable purpose;

5 d. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that the business affairs  
6 of the Individual Defendants and the Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned  
7 herein were, so mixed and intermingled that the same cannot reasonably be segregated, and the same  
8 are inextricable confusion. The Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned herein  
9 were, used by the Individual Defendants as mere shells and conduits for the conduct of certain of  
10 their, and each of their affairs. The Alter Ego Defendants are, and at all relevant times mentioned  
11 herein were, the alter egos of the Individual Defendants;

12 e. The recognition of the separate existence of the Individual Defendants from  
13 the Alter Ego Defendants would promote injustice insofar that it would permit these defendants to  
14 insulate themselves from liability to Plaintiff for violations to the Civil Code, Government Code,  
15 and other statutory violations. The corporate existence of these defendants should thus be  
16 disregarded in equity and for the ends of justice because such disregard is necessary to avoid fraud  
17 and injustice to Plaintiff herein;

18 f. Accordingly, the Alter Ego Defendants constitute the alter ego of the  
19 Individual Defendants (and vice versa), and the fiction of their separate corporate existence must be  
20 disregarded.

21 46. As a result of the aforementioned facts, Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based  
22 thereon alleges that Defendants, and each of them, are joint employers.

23 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

24 **(Civil Penalties Under the Private Attorneys' General Act (2004) – Against All Defendants)**

25 47. Plaintiff re-alleges and incorporates by reference all of the allegations set forth in the  
26 preceding paragraphs as though fully set forth hereat.

27 ///

28 ///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

2  
3  
4  
5  
6

7  
8  
9  
0  
1  
2  
3

4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
0  
1

## 2

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

1 entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor; and other such  
2 information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

3 52. Labor Code section 226.3 states that "[a]ny employer who violates subdivision (a)  
4 of Section 226 shall be subject to a civil penalty in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250)  
5 per employee per violation in an initial citation and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) per employee for  
6 each violation in a subsequent citation, for which the employer fails to provide the employee a wage  
7 deduction statement or fails to keep the records required in subdivision (a) of Section 226."

8 53. Labor Code section 226.3 further provides that "[t]he civil penalties provided for in  
9 this section are in addition to any other penalty provided by law."

10 54. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants had  
11 and have a policy or practice of failing to furnish Aggrieved Employees with itemized wage  
12 statements that accurately reflect gross wages earned; total hours worked; net wages earned; all  
13 deductions; all applicable hourly rates in effect and the corresponding number of hours worked at  
14 each hourly rate in effect during the pay period; the legal name of the employer and/or the name and  
15 address of the legal entity securing the employer's services if the employer is a farm labor contractor;  
16 and other such information as required by Labor Code section 226, subdivision (a).

17 55. Pursuant to Labor Code section 226.3, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are  
18 entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' violation of Labor Code section 226, subdivision  
19 (a) in the amount of two hundred fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period  
20 for the initial violation, and one thousand dollars (\$1,000) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay  
21 period for each subsequent violation.

22 Violation of Labor Code § 558

23 56. Pursuant to Labor Code section 558, subdivision (a): "Any employer or other person  
24 acting on behalf of an employer who violates, or causes to be violated . . . any provision regulating  
25 hours and days of work in any of the Industrial Welfare Commission" shall be subject to a civil  
26 penalty as follows:

- 27 (1) For any initial violation, fifty dollars (\$50) for each underpaid employee and for each  
28 pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to an amount sufficient

1 to recover underpaid wages;

2 (2) For each subsequent violation, one hundred dollars (\$100) for each underpaid  
3 employee for each pay period for which the employee was underpaid in addition to  
4 an amount sufficient to recover underpaid wages;

5 (3) Wages recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected employee.”

6 57. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants, and  
7 each of them, violated, or caused to be violated, the Labor Code sections described herein, including  
8 causing Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees not to: be paid with the rates of pay and overtime  
9 rates of pay applicable to their employment, allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the  
10 regular payday designated by employer, the name of the employer, including any “doing business  
11 as” names used, the name, address, and telephone number of the workers’ compensation insurance  
12 carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and other pertinent information.

13 58. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,  
14 pursuant to Labor Code section 558, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover  
15 civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount fifty dollars  
16 (\$50) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and one hundred dollars  
17 (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

18 Violation of Labor Code § 1174.5

19 59. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (b) has required  
20 every person employing labor in California to “[a]llow any member of the commission or the  
21 employees of the Division of Labor Standards Enforcement free access to the place of business or  
22 employment of the person to secure any information or make any investigation that they are  
23 authorized by this chapter to ascertain or make. The commission may inspect or make excerpts,  
24 relating to the employment of employees, from the books, reports, contracts, payrolls, documents,  
25 or papers of the person.”

26 60. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (c) has required  
27 every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep a record showing the names and addresses of  
28 all employees employed and the ages of all minors.”

61. At all times mentioned herein, Labor Code section 1174, subdivision (d) has required every person employing labor in California to “[k]eep, at a central location in the state or at the plants or establishments at which employees are employed, payroll records showing the hours worked daily by and the wages paid to, and the number of piece-rate units earned by and applicable piece rate paid to, employees employed at the respective plants or establishments. These records shall be kept in accordance with rules established for this purpose by the commission, but in any case, shall be kept on file for not less than three years. An employer shall not prohibit an employee from maintaining a personal record of hours worked, or, if paid on a piece-rate basis, piece-rate units earned.”

62. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, “[a]ny person employing labor who willfully fails to maintain the records required by subdivision (c) of [Labor Code] Section 1174 or accurate and complete records required by subdivision (d) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, or to allow any member of the commission or employees of the division to inspect records pursuant to subdivision (b) of [Labor Code] Section 1174, shall be subject to a civil penalty of five hundred dollars (\$500).

63. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants have willfully failed to keep adequate or accurate time records including wage statements and similar payroll documents under Labor Code section 226, documents signed to obtain or hold employment under Labor Code section 432, personnel records under Labor Code section 1198.5, and time records under Labor Code section 1174.

64. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations, pursuant to Labor Code section 1174.5, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to recover civil penalties for Defendants' herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount of five hundred dollars (\$500) per violation per Aggrieved Employee.

## Violation of Labor Code § 1197.1

65. Pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, subdivision (a): “Any employer or other person acting either individually or as an officer, agent, or employee of another person, who pays or causes to be paid to any employee a wage less than the minimum fixed by an applicable state or local law, or by an order of the commission shall be subject to a civil penalty, restitution of wages,

1 liquidated damages payable to the employee, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to  
2 Section 203 as follows:

3 (1) For any initial violation that is intentionally committed, one hundred dollars  
4 (\$100) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the  
5 employee is underpaid. This amount shall be in addition to an amount  
6 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section  
7 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

8 (2) For each subsequent violation for the same specific offense, two hundred fifty  
9 dollars (\$250) for each underpaid employee for each pay period for which the  
10 employee is underpaid regardless of whether the initial violation is  
11 intentionally committed. This amount shall be in addition to an amount  
12 sufficient to recover underpaid wages, liquidated damages pursuant to Section  
13 1194.2, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to Section 203.

14 (3) Wages, liquidated damages, and any applicable penalties imposed pursuant to  
15 Section 203, recovered pursuant to this section shall be paid to the affected  
16 employee.”

17 66. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges, that Defendants caused  
18 Plaintiff and Aggrieved Employees not to be paid minimum wages as a result of Defendants, without  
19 limitation, routinely failing to pay Plaintiff or other Aggrieved Employees’ minimum wages for all  
20 hours worked or otherwise under Defendants’ control due to, without limitation, routinely failing to  
21 accurately track and/or pay for all hours actually worked; detrimental rounding or manipulation of  
22 time entries; paying straight pay instead of overtime or otherwise failing to pay overtime hours at  
23 the proper overtime rate of pay; engaging, suffering, or permitting employees to work off the clock,  
24 entitling Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees to actual and liquidated damages.

25 67. As a direct and proximate result of the herein-described Labor Code violations,  
26 pursuant to Labor Code section 1197.1, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees are entitled to  
27 recover civil penalties for Defendants’ herein-described Labor Code violations in the amount one  
28 hundred dollars (\$100) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for the initial violation, and

1 two hundred and fifty dollars (\$250) for each Aggrieved Employee per pay period for each  
2 subsequent violation.

3 Civil Penalties Under Labor Code § 2699

4 68. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (a), notwithstanding any other  
5 provision of law, any provision of the Labor Code that provides for a civil penalty to be assessed  
6 and collected by the LWDA or any of its departments, divisions, commissions, boards, agencies or  
7 employees for a violation of the Labor Code may, as an alternative, be recovered through a civil  
8 action brought by an aggrieved employee on behalf of himself or herself and other current or former  
9 employees pursuant to the procedures specified in Labor Code section 2699.3.

10 69. Pursuant to Labor Code section 2699, subdivision (f), for all provisions of the Labor  
11 Code except those for which a civil penalty is specifically provided, the established civil penalty for  
12 a violation of those provisions is as follows: if, at the time of the alleged violation, the person  
13 employs one or more employees, the civil penalty is one hundred dollars (\$100) for each aggrieved  
14 employee per pay period for the initial violation and two hundred dollars (\$200) for each aggrieved  
15 employee per pay period for each subsequent violation.

16 70. Plaintiff is informed and believes, and based thereon alleges that Defendants, and  
17 each of them, violated the Labor Code sections described herein, including, without limitation, for  
18 the failure to: pay the rates of pay and overtime rates of pay applicable to their employment,  
19 allowances claimed as part of the minimum wage, the regular payday designated by Defendants, the  
20 name of the employer, including "doing business as" names used, the name, address, and telephone  
21 number of the workers' compensation insurance carrier, information regarding paid sick leave, and  
22 other pertinent information required to be disclosed by Defendants under Labor Code section  
23 2810.5, failing to provide Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees with the amount of paid sick  
24 leave required to be provided pursuant to California and local laws.

25 71. Moreover, Plaintiff and other Aggrieved Employees within the State of California  
26 whom he seeks to represent are entitled to an award of reasonable attorneys' fees and costs in  
27 connection with their herein-described claims for civil penalties.

28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

2

## 3

4  
5

- 6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

15

15

17

18

10

19

**20**

**21**